Previous references.
Anekal Pallegar Family No 40
Pension to Poor.

1911.
(S+A

File No. 253
Serial Nos. 1–2

Later references.
S+A 51–12 Sr. 91+1070 & 72
S+A 51–12 Sr. 13, 13a, 14
a 42–184 B April 1914 -
1–10, B August 1919
C & Dep 200–22
S M 62. 25. 1+2.
S+A 378–26 (1–2)

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1–2

Part B. for April 12

SUBJECT.

Prayer of AKKajammanni & the Anekal pallegar Family ~~pension~~ praying for the distribution of the pension drawn by her

From AKKajammanni and Hiriammanna (thro' their Council Mrs. L. Srinivasiengar)
Memorial dy 25. 10 11.
prays that the the order sanctioning the adoption of Chickarayare may be reconsidered and the pension enjoyed by AKKajammanni be ordered to be continued to Hiriammanna

G. R. S. 58 To Mrs. AKKajammanni and Mrs. Hiriammanna
No Fl 4.277 dy 8.4.12. Informed that H. has

is not vacant at present and that the question of its devolution will be taken up when it falls vacant

No 4728 of 8.4.12. To the asst Comptroller in charge of the State Auditor Treasury

Forwards copy of the above for information

G.R.S. 11]

1911.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(S+A)

NOTES.

File No. 255 / 11

FILE HEADING.

Anekal Pallegar Family Pensions.

From

Mrs. Akkajammanni & Hiriammanni, (thro' their Counsel Mr. K. Srinivasiengar).

No. Memorial Dated 25-10-XI Received 27-X-11.

Diary No.	Enclos.	Spare Copies.	Serial No.
1615			1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Praying that the order sanctioning the adoption of Chikavyaru may be reconsidered & the pension enjoyed by Akkajammanni be ordered to be continued to Hiriammanni.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

Secretary's orders:

1" Presented in person by Mr: K.S. Iyengar. (He says " his Clients wish to be heard by Dewan in person " before disposal).

2" Put up the references very early.

Jo C.S.B.
27-10-11.

NOTES—First Sheet.

(SPB—30,000—27-6-11)

General and Revenue Secretariat.

S&M File No. 255 of 1911.

Serial No.

V.Q.O.P.Y.N

Submitted with references.

Mal-85
28-X-11

Having been adopted Chelliah Arumugam the petitioner deceased & the then Chairman was duly under the Thesawalamai the son of the first memorialist Chellappamani. The adoption having been subsequently recognized Ordinance No 11 of 1876 allows that this son Chelliah Arumugam No 11 is the legitimate successor to the premises of Chelliah Arumugam (No 1) & appears to have been recognized perhaps he was preferred to the Banawandan or his deserving Chelliah Arumugam No 2 who have become the Banawandan. His rights therefore is indisputable. Chellappamani during the pendency of her name is to mean accidentally the adoption was not recognized and does not seem to have any right to dispose of accordingly the desire or intended it against a legal & relevant both Chellappamani and Thuraisamy the 2d memorialist prefer Chelliah Arumugam No 11 - Can any claim have subsisted under the Thesawalamai Law. The former as the adopted grandmother the 2d & wife living separate from her husband

Chelliah Arumugam in case

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

D/B—65,000—27-4-09

Serial No.

per 20 Rs as her maintenance during life of the lines separated & nothing more. The memorial Cadambas fails and is rejected.

(sd) Dewan

4/30/11

Heirship 1/2

6. It is not clear if Chikka raya (no.1.) is still alive, - apparently not.

7. There is no sufficient reason to revise the order of 5 Feb 89 in the manner suggested by the petr.

8. All that need be done when the petr Akkajammanni dies, the pension is registered in Chikka raya's name, is to direct the payment of a suitable maintenance to Hiriamm-ni. The amount may be fixed at 1/4 or 1/2 the pension.

9. The request of the petitioners to be heard by the Dewan before the disposal of the case is submitted for orders.

(sd) Dewan

CSB

28/4/11

1/5/11

14120

30.11.10

Akkajammanni (the Memorialist no 1) is now drawing the Palegar pension. The pension

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—55,000—27-4-09

Serial No.

is not vacant at present - & therefore its devolution cannot be considered at present - The question of revising the Order of 1889 in regard to the devolution of the pension can be considered when the pensionary allowance falls vacant

11 Yours

Putup draft

SB 6/2/12

12) Draft endorsement submitted.

MM-85 4-3-XII RR 11/11/12. fwd secy

13) Issue

SB 29/2/12

2. To Mrs Akhajammanni & Hiriammanni. No: R4277 dt 8/4/12. Informs that their pension is not vacant at present and that the question its devolution will be taken up when it falls vacant no: 4278 dt 8/4/12 The Asst Comptroller in charge of the State Treasury Nursing forwards copy of the above for information.

GPB—55,000—27-4-09

To,

The Dewan to His Highness
The Maharaja of Mysore.

The humble memorial of Akkajammanni and (2) Hiriammanni, respectfully showeth:-

I That the first memorialist is the widow of one Veera Chickka Rayaru, a State Palegar Pensioner of - Anekal who died in December 1861 without male issue but leaving behind him his widow, first memorialist and an only daughter by name Maligammanni by first Memorialist.

II That during his life-time the said Veera Chickka-Rayaru was drawing a State pension from the Government of Mysore.

III That after the death of Veera Chickka Rayaru the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore was graciously pleased to confer the said pension on and continue the same to the first memorialist who is now drawing a consolidated pension of Rs.222/6/0 a month.

IV That the petition of the first memorialist and her mother-in-law in 1861 to the then Chief Commissioner of Mysore praying for the recognition of the adoption of one Chickka Rayaru (hereafter called No.1) by the first memorialist was disallowed and his adoption was refused to be recognised. One of the chief objects of that petition was to make provision through the said adopted son

for

for her daughter the said Maligammanni and the latter's children by securing the recognition by the Government of his adoption and by causing the continuance of the pension through him in her line.

V. That as however the adoption was refused to be recognised by His Highness' Government the first memorialist had no alternative but to wait till such time as the Government might be pleased to reconsider her case. Further as the said Maligammanni was thereafter married to the Palegar of Sulegere, the immediate necessity for repeating the first memorialist's prayer to Government as above said became less urgent.

N
Bowring's order on the petition

VI That in 1887 the 2nd memorialist had been born. She was brought up by the first memorialist who intended to memorialise the Government of His Highness the Maharaja to continue the grant of the pension to her after the death of the first memorialist. As the 1st memorialist then believed and was advised that this object could be validly and effectively secured by interposing a male and securing the continuance of the pension through him it was arranged that the Second memorialist who was then about 6 years old should be married to one Chickka Rayaru (hereafter called No.2) the eldest son of the above mentioned Chickka Rayaru (No.1) whose adoption was refused to be recognised; and that the first memorialist should adopt Chickka Rayaru (2) so that the State pension might be continued through him in her line and the same might enure to the benefit of the 2nd memorialist.

N
Bowring's order on petition

VII With this object the first memorialist made a peti-

petition dated 6-10-87 to His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore which was referred to the then Dewan Saheb for disposal. The Dewan Saheb in his order dated 2-12-87 expressed his views to the effect that the prayer of the first memorialist to adopt for the 2nd time the son of a person whose adoption had been refused to be recognised was a futile one and could not be granted and the adoption could not be permitted. As however the real object and intention of the petitioner appears to have been sufficiently impressed on his attention, he had the kindness to pass an order calling upon the -- Khajana Bakshi to make further enquiry and report on the Canarese petition of the first memorialist. From a perusal of it, as a whole, it will be clearly seen that the object of the memorialist was four-fold:-

(i) to continue the pension to enure to a person who might be considered to come within the line of her family;

(ii) to marry the second memorialist to Chickka-Rayaru (2) in case she succeeded in getting his adoption recognised;

(iii) by so marrying the second memorialist to the adoptee to ensure the permanance and continuance of the pension for the 2nd memorialist; and

(iv) to cement the family of the first memorialist with that of the first adoptee, viz., Chickka-Rayaru (No.1) and thus obviate all possible dispute on his part to the prejudice of the second memorialist, thereafter.

VIII In reply to the said order a pretty long report was addressed to the Dewan Saheb by the Khajana Bakshi

in which he set out the history of the Paliaput and of the family of the first memorialist, and being himself favourably impressed with the object and the policy -- suggested by the petitioner in her petition, made a -- strong recommendation that the Government of His Highness the Maharaja may be graciously pleased to recognise the adoption of Chickka Rayaru (2) under and in consideration of the circumstances set out in her petition in -- pursuance of the liberal policy ennunciated in the proceedings of the Dewan to His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore. (General, Dated 29-10-87).

IX On the receipt of the said report the then Dewan Saheb passed Proceedings No.6925/667 dated 5-2-1889 -- recommending that the adoption of Chickka Rayaru (No.1 as appears from the contest) by the first memorialist may be recognised as valid, apparently in supercession of the order passed in 1862, although the first memorialist did not ask for the recognition of that adoption.

X As however the Dewan Saheb was pleased to say in the order that the pension that was then being drawn - by the first memorialist might be continued to be paid to her till her death and that it should descend to — Chickka Rayaru No.1's eldest son (Chickka Rayaru(No.2) to whom the second memorialist was proposed to be married, and thus the object of the first memorialist's petition of 6-10-87 was substantially conceded and gained, the first memorialist did not think it worth while to trouble the Government to make the order any clearer.

XI Therefore the second memorialist was married to Chickka Rayaru (No.2) and both were under the protection of the first memorialist for some years.

XII But about 15 years ago Chickka Rayaru (2) left the house of the first memorialist, forsook the 2nd memorialist and has taken to another wife by whom he has two sons and one daughters. This most unexpected turn of events which could not possibly have been anticipated and provided against has upset all the fondly cherished hopes and expectations of the first memorialist and renders a reconsideration of the said order imperative and vitally necessary.

XIII The first memorialist is about 75 years old and may die any moment. But the dream of her life has not been realised, namely, a comfortable competence for the second memorialist because Chickka Rayaru (No.2) is setting up and asserting a right to the pension after the first memorialist's death taking advantage of the letter and language of the said order dated 5/2/89 and ignoring its spirit and object.

XIV Thus it will be seen that the language in which the said order is couched, as interpreted by Chickka-Rayaru (2) frustrates the object of the petition of which it is the result and to some extent contravenes the spirit of the liberal policy above referred to which lays down that the pension should be secured to and kept within the line of the next-of-kin of the Palegar families and is likely to work great hardship on the second memorialist, who is still in her prime of life, to the rest of her life after the first memorialist expires and will have the effect of handing over the pension to the offspring of Chickka Rayaru (2) by a woman who is a stranger to the family, which

is altogether opposed to the spirit of the report of the Khajana Bakshi, who has clearly stated therein - that the prayer contained in the first memorialist's petition may be granted as its object was to secure the succession of the pension for her daughter's -- offspring. It is abundantly significant that in the order of the Dewan Saheb dated 5-2-89 though the -- adoption of Chickka Rayaru (1) was recognised as valid - the pension was not made to devolve on him or his -- heirs but on his eldest son Chickka Rayaru (2) to -- whom it had been arranged that the second memorialist should be married and that she was so married to -- Chickka Rayaru (2) because such order was passed.

XV The second memorialist is devoid of any kind of support and means of livelihood beyond what she is now getting from the first memorialist out of the latter's pension and will have no home after her death as it is beyond all possibility that she could live with Chicka-Rayaru (2) even if she is taken back, for obvious --- reasons.

XVI. Therefore your memorialists 1 & 2 respectfully pray that you may be kindly pleased to recommend to His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore to graciously re-consider the order dated 5-2-89 and modify it so as to make the pension enure to the second memorialist for the rest of her life and she may be thereby placed - above need and want. As a female scion of, and closely connected by blood with, the Anekal Palegar family and as one intended to be benefited by the grant of the - prayer contained in the petition of 6-10-87, the

second

second memorialist humbly begs to add that she is deserving of the concession, she solicits the Government of His Highness to show, not to say that she -- has a right to the pension and respectfully prays and trusts that the benignant consideration which His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore from time to time has markedly shown to the Anekal Paleput and its members and scions through all its history will not be withheld from your most humble memorialists.

Your memorialists further pray that all the previous records and correspondence may be kindly perused and as the memorialists happen to be Ghosha ladies, that their Counsel may be heard on this memorial.

25/10/11

Greenwood Mungen
Counsel for petrs
25/10/11

Mr. L. Sreenivasa Iyengar,

Advocate,

Bangalore



ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ.

191 ನಂಬರು.

ವಾದಿ ಯಾ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರ್‌ಗ್ಳು. ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ ಯಾ ಅಪೊನೆಂಟ್.

1. ಅತ್ತಿಚಿಕ್ಕನಹಳ್ಳಿ,
2. ಹಿರಿಯಮ್ಮ ಅಹೋ | VS.

ಮ|| ರಾ|| ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಕಂಟೋನ್ಮೆಂಟ್ ಅಮಲ್ದಾರ್ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನ V. ಕೆ. ಶೇಷಾಚಾರಿ ಯವರಿಗೆ

ಅಡ್ವೊಕೇಟರು ಬರೆಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟ ವಕಾಲತ್‌ನಾಮಾ.

ಈ ಮೊಖದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ನನ್ನ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಆಬ್ಜೆರುವರಿಗೂ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿವಾದ ಜರಗಿಸಲಿಕ್ಕೂ, ನನ್ನ ಪರ ಆಗುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾವಿಧವಾದ ಆರ್ಡರನ್ನೂ ಡಿಕ್ರಿಯನ್ನೂ ಜಾರಿಕ್ರಮ ನಡಿಸಿ ಹಣ ವಸೂಲುಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವದಕ್ಕೂ, ನನಗೆ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಿಂದ ಸಲ್ಲಬೇಕಾಗುವ ಡಿಕ್ರಿಮೊಬಲಗು ಶಿಲ್ಕುಮೊಬಲಗು ಸಹಾ ಪಡಿಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ, ನನಗಾಗಿ ರೀಫಂಡ್ ಆಗತಕ್ಕ ಸ್ಟಾಂಪನ್ನು ಪಡಿಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ, ದಸ್ತೈವಜು ವಗೈರೆಗಳನ್ನು ವಾಪಸುಪಡಿಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ ಸಹ ತಮಗೆ ಈ ಮೂಲ್ಕ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದೇನೆ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ತಾವಾಗಲಿ ಯಾ ತಮಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಮತ್ಯಾವ ಲಾಯರಾಗಲಿ ಡಿಟೊ ಮೊಖದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡಿಸುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ನಾನು ಖುದ್ದು ಇದ್ದು ನಡಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕ್ಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಬದ್ಧನಾಗಿ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ.

ತಾರೀಖು ರುಜು.

ಈ ಮೊಖ್ತ್ಯಾರುನಾಮಾ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ನನಿಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯಸ್ತರಾಗಿ ಸಮಕ್ಷಮ ರುಜು ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಈ ಮೊಖ್ತ್ಯಾರುನಾಮಾ ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿದೇನೆ. 20/10/1900

ಈ ಫಾರಂ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸಿಟಿ ಚಿಕ್ಕಪೇಟೆ ೨೬೬ ನೆ ನಂಬರು ಷಾಪ್‌ಕೀಪರ್ (ಎಚ್: ಬಿ. ಚಿಕ್ಕಣ್ಣ ಶೆಟ್ಟರಲ್ಲಿ) ದೊರೆಯುತ್ತ. 2

VOKKALIGARA SANGHA PRESS. BANGALORE CITY.

G.R.S. 26]

2/13

255

File No. 11

Serial No. 2

Diary No. of letter replied to 1615

No. R4277

General and Revenue Secretariat

(SM)

, the *19* .

8-4-12

To

Mrs. A K Kajammanni &

Mrs. Hiriammanni of the

Anekal Pallegar Family,

c/o. L. Srinivasiengar Esq.

Advocate,

Bangalore City.

Date of issue 8-4-12

Signed by W L Narasimha

With reference to their

memorial of the 25th Octr 1911

addressed to the Dewan of

Mysore, ~~praying for the~~

the petitioners are informed

that the ~~question of resisting the~~ ~~petition~~ ~~over~~

over.

SUBJECT.

No. ~~6925/617~~ & 5 - 12. 1889

~~regarding the devolution of the~~

~~pension cannot be considered effected~~

~~during the life time of the~~

~~Sirkeydacy - [illegible]~~

Now drawn by

~~No~~ A.V. Rajamannar

Regarding pension on the order

1889 in regard to the devolution

the pension can only be considered

when the pensioner falls Vacant

By order

dtd 29/12

dtd: Secretary.

11-3-12

Mul-88

9-3-XII.

Memo:

No 96278

& 8-4-12

Copy of the above is forwarded to the Assistt. Comptroller, State Treasy. Trivandrum for information.

By order

dtd: Secretary

Mul-88

9-3-XII

11-3-12.

List of enclosures,

Copied by

Examined by

11/4/12

GPB—20,000—25-9-10